Fish disease, stress and transmission pathways

Grant Kinkead
Independent Researcher, Melbourne, VIC, Australia
grant@kinkead.au

***Abstract*—Fish disease is best understood as an outcome of interacting pathogen, host and environmental conditions, rather than pathogen presence alone. This paper examines how stress and host condition relate to disease, and how exposure through shared water or contact with carrier fish can precede infection. An aquaponics health review provides the organising account of susceptibility, environmental conditions, nutrition and husbandry. Experimental studies add narrower observations: a channel-catfish bath challenge documented rapid tissue injury after exposure to virulent Aeromonas hydrophila; fin-clipped immersion challenges showed differences among bacterial isolates and among host-treatment groups; and a cohabitation study recovered Edwardsiella tarda from catfish housed with exposed carrier fish. Together, these sources distinguish pathogen exposure, observable disease and the conditions that may alter outcomes. They do not establish a single natural transmission route, quantify routine-system risk or prove the proposed mechanisms behind every mortality difference. Interpreting fish disease therefore requires attention to both possible exposure pathways and the limits of evidence obtained under controlled challenge conditions.**

I. Introduction

Fish disease cannot be explained adequately by identifying a pathogen without considering the fish and its surroundings. A review of aquatic animal health in aquaponics describes disease in relation to susceptible hosts, pathogens, environmental conditions, nutrition and husbandry, and places stress and transmission within that combined account [1]. These factors answer different questions: exposure concerns how an agent reaches fish, whereas susceptibility concerns the conditions under which exposure may be followed by illness. Their interaction matters when interpreting an apparent outbreak because detection of an agent and evidence of disease are not interchangeable. This paper examines those distinctions through evidence on experimental exposure, host condition and cohabitation.

The consequences of exposure can become apparent rapidly under a defined experimental challenge. Channel catfish bathed for six hours at 32 °C with Aeromonas hydrophila strain ML09-119 had 62.4% mortality, compared with none in broth controls; examined tissues showed early splenic and gastric damage followed by intestinal, gill and kidney pathology [2]. This sequence connects a specified exposure to measurable injury, but the bath was an experimental protocol, not a demonstration that natural infection follows a waterborne-only route. The distinction sets a boundary for the argument developed here: challenge studies can establish observations under their stated conditions without, by themselves, reconstructing transmission in an ordinary system.

Pathogen identity also needs finer interpretation than a species name alone. In a fin-clipped channel-catfish immersion challenge, five sampled US A. hydrophila isolates each produced at least 60% mortality, whereas strain ZC1 produced 26.7%; sampled lineages differed in their complements of genes associated with a type VI secretion system [3]. Those observations make variation among isolates relevant to disease outcomes, yet they do not prove that the gene differences caused the mortality contrast. The following sections examine host and exposure conditions alongside such pathogen variation, then assess what the combined evidence can and cannot establish about fish disease, stress and transmission pathways.

II. Background and Scope

Cohabitation offers one way to investigate whether proximity to exposed fish can be followed by infection in other fish. In a five-day experiment, catfish housed with Edwardsiella tarda-exposed silver rasbora had recoverable bacteria in sampled organs, while negative controls had no detected counts; all challenged catfish groups reached 100% mortality by 120 hours [4]. The finding supports a bounded account of transmission associated with the experimental cohabitation conditions. It does not identify which contact or environmental step delivered the bacteria to each catfish. The study therefore contributes evidence of an exposure pathway involving carrier fish, while leaving the relative contribution of possible routes within that setting unresolved.

A different experimental approach held pathogen challenge in view while comparing host-treatment groups. After A. hydrophila immersion, 72-hour channel-catfish mortality was 77% among fin-clipped unfed fish, 70% among fin-clipped fed fish, 62% among unclipped fed fish and 45% among unclipped unfed fish [5]. These outcomes show that injury and feeding status cannot be treated as irrelevant descriptors of the challenge. They also resist a simple nutritional conclusion: the two fin-clipped groups did not differ significantly ($p = 0.6185$), and all groups were fed after the first day [5]. The observed contrasts warrant attention to host condition without establishing an optimal feeding or fasting practice.

The cohabitation and immersion studies answer complementary, not identical, questions. Recovery of E. tarda from catfish after housing with exposed rasbora links a defined shared setting to subsequent bacterial detection [4]. Comparisons among injured and uninjured catfish exposed to A. hydrophila instead examine variation in outcomes within a deliberately constructed challenge [5]. Neither design isolates

every step between initial exposure and disease under ordinary operating conditions. Within this paper, a transmission pathway means an evidenced or plausible sequence by which exposure reaches fish, not a claim that one route has been demonstrated as exclusive. This scope preserves the distinction between experimental observation and broader causal interpretation.

III. Core Concepts and Mechanisms

The central causal distinction is between exposure, infection and tissue injury. The aquaponics health review treats disease as an interaction involving host susceptibility, pathogens and conditions of care [1]. In the catfish bath challenge, exposure to one A. hydrophila strain was followed by lesions in several organs and substantial mortality relative to controls [2]. Taken together, these sources support a sequence in which encountering a pathogen is only one part of the explanation, while injury is observable evidence that disease has developed under the specified conditions. They do not establish that every exposed fish follows the same progression, nor do the reported lesions identify the independent contribution of each observed bacterial structure.

Stress is relevant to this account as a condition of the host and its environment, rather than a substitute name for infection. The health review places environmental conditions, nutrition and husbandry alongside host and pathogen factors in explaining disease [1]. The injury and feeding comparison provides a narrower test of how particular pre-challenge conditions coincide with survival after exposure: mortality differed across its treatment groups, although the two fin-clipped groups were not significantly different [5]. Those data support careful consideration of host condition, not a demonstrated physiological pathway from a measured stress response to infection. A precise account must therefore distinguish the broad stress framework from mechanisms not directly established in these experiments.

Transmission pathways likewise need to be separated from outcomes measured after transmission may have occurred. Cohabitation with E. tarda-exposed rasbora preceded bacterial recovery from catfish organs and mortality in the challenged groups [4]. Immersion studies exposed catfish directly to A. hydrophila and measured mortality or tissue damage, but their protocols do not establish how the bacterium usually moves between fish in an operating system [2], [3]. These designs together illustrate two levels of evidence: an observed association between cohabitation and subsequent infection, and the consequences of experimentally delivered exposure. Neither level alone specifies every intermediate step, so descriptions of contact, shared water or entry into tissues must remain appropriately bounded.

IV. Evidence Synthesis

Across the sources, fish disease emerges from variation on both sides of the host, pathogen encounter. The health review identifies host, pathogen and environmental conditions as interacting elements [1]. Experimentally, mortality differed among sampled A. hydrophila isolates under a fin-clipped challenge, and it also differed among injury and feeding groups in a separate immersion study [3], [5]. These findings are consistent with a multi-factor explanation rather than a rule that pathogen presence alone fixes the outcome. They cannot be combined into a common effect size: the studies changed different conditions and did not test a shared set of isolates, host treatments and exposures. Their value is explanatory complementarity, not a numerical estimate transferable across settings.

The studies also examine different points along a potential disease sequence. Cohabitation with exposed carrier fish was followed by recovery of E. tarda from catfish organs [4]; a controlled A. hydrophila bath challenge documented early organ injury and subsequent mortality [2]. Read together, they help distinguish evidence that an exposed setting can precede infection from evidence describing damage after a specified pathogen challenge. They do not form a single experimentally verified chain because they involve different bacteria and experimental designs. In particular, neither the cohabitation result nor the bath challenge resolves whether a particular natural route is necessary or sufficient for disease in other fish populations.

Apparent mechanistic clues require a further distinction between association and proof. Sampled A. hydrophila lineages differed in type VI secretion system-related gene complements as well as mortality outcomes in the specified challenge, but the data do not establish that those genetic differences caused the outcome contrast [3]. In another study, early gastrointestinal injury accompanied differences among challenged host groups, while the overall histology-score comparison was not significant [5]. Thus, tissue observations and genetic comparisons add detail to the disease account without closing its causal gaps. The defensible synthesis is that pathogen variation and host condition both merit consideration, while their precise contributions require designs that test the proposed links directly.

V. Practical Implications and Limitations

The evidence favours interpreting a disease event through more than one line of observation. The health review relates disease to susceptible fish, pathogen exposure, environmental conditions, nutrition and husbandry [1]. The bath challenge shows why outcome measures alone provide an incomplete picture: mortality was accompanied by organ-specific injury detected over time under a tightly specified exposure [2]. Considering exposure circumstances together with observed fish condition and injury is therefore more informative than treating a positive pathogen finding as a complete causal explanation. This is an interpretive implication, not proof that any particular assessment procedure prevents disease or identifies its route in an individual event.

Experimental severity must not be mistaken for an ordinary transmission rate. The cohabitation study used a very high reported carrier challenge dose over a short observation period and lacked an explicitly uninfected-rasbora cohabitation

control [4]. The A. hydrophila studies likewise used specified immersion or bath protocols, including deliberate fin clipping in some comparisons [2], [3], [5]. Their mortality values describe those experimental conditions. Generalising them to routine systems would require evidence on exposure and host conditions in those systems. In particular, the observed association between carrier cohabitation and bacterial recovery cannot establish how frequently infection spreads through any single natural pathway.

A similar limit applies to claims about stress and modifiable host condition. The review supports considering nutrition and husbandry within a broader disease framework [1], while the injury and feeding challenge documents treatment-group differences without establishing a general feeding effect or optimal fasting interval [5]. Small tissue-examination samples and the single-host, single-strain conditions of the bath challenge further constrain claims about the timing and mechanism of injury beyond that experiment [2]. The highest-value validation would separate proposed exposure routes and host conditions while following infection and injury over time. Until such evidence is available, specific management prescriptions or universal causal rankings would exceed what these sources demonstrate.

VI. Conclusion

Fish disease, stress and transmission pathways are connected but distinct explanatory concepts. Disease concerns an outcome arising under particular host, pathogen and environmental conditions, while a transmission pathway concerns how exposure may occur [1]. Controlled A. hydrophila challenges demonstrate variation in mortality, injury and isolate-associated outcomes [2], [3], [5]; E. tarda cohabitation demonstrates bacterial recovery and disease after catfish were housed with exposed carrier fish [4]. Together, these observations support a multi-factor account. They do not establish a universal route, a single stress mechanism or outcomes that can be transferred directly from experimental challenges to ordinary systems.

Further evidence should resolve the steps that these studies leave separate: how exposure occurs, which host conditions alter outcomes, and which proposed pathogen features account for observed differences. That priority follows from the unresolved route in the cohabitation and immersion experiments and the unproven causal role of isolate-associated genetic differences [3], [4], [5]. Until those links are tested directly, the soundest interpretation is to state each study's exposure conditions and measured outcomes precisely, and to keep broader causal claims proportionate to them.

Acknowledgment

The author used artificial intelligence tools to assist with manuscript drafting and revision, and with LaTeX and bibliography preparation. The author reviewed all AI-assisted output and remains responsible for the final content.

References

[1] H. Y. Yildiz, V. Radosavljevic, G. Parisi, and A. Cvetkovikj, "Insight into risks in aquatic animal health in aquaponics," *Aquaponics Food Production Systems*, 2019.

[2] H. Abdelhamed, I. Ibrahim, W. Baumgartner, M. L. Lawrence, and A. Karsi, "Characterization of histopathological and ultrastructural changes in channel catfish experimentally infected with virulent aeromonas hydrophila," *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 2017.

[3] C. R. Rasmussen-Ivey, M. J. Hossain, S. E. Odom, J. S. Terhune, W. G. Hemstreet, C. A. Shoemaker, D. Zhang, D.-H. Xu, M. J. Griffin, Y.-J. Liu, M. J. Figueras, S. R. Santos, J. C. Newton, and M. R. Liles, "Classification of a hypervirulent aeromonas hydrophila pathotype responsible for epidemic outbreaks in warm-water fishes," *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 2016.

[4] D. Kurniawati, E. Fitriana, W. Tjahjaningsih, M. F. Ulkhaq, M. A. Pardede, and J.-Y. Loh, "Hematological alterations and bacterial abundance of edwardsiella tarda in catfish (clarias sp.) cohabiting with carrier silver rasbora (rasbora argyrotaenia)," *Open Veterinary Journal*, 2025.

[5] Y. K. Soku, M. D. Lange, J. W. Abernathy, N. M. Sankappa, C. A. Shoemaker, K. Hayden, L. K. Andersen, I. Phillips, T. Nashar, T. Samuel, and A. Mohamed, "Feed status and skin injury modulate immunopathology, global gene expression, and survival in channel catfish during virulent aeromonas hydrophila infection," *Frontiers in Immunology*, 2025.